# In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1952

---

No. 250

---

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Petitioner*

v.

CORA PRESSON PARTRIDGE, EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF GEORGE MCL. PRESSON

---

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

---

The Solicitor General, on behalf of the United States, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment entered in this case on April 15, 1952, by the United States Court of Claims.

### OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Claims (R. 14-21) is not reported.

### JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Claims was entered on April 15, 1952 (R. 25). Respondent's motion to amend the judgment was denied on May

6, 1952 (R. 25-26). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1255.

### QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether service in the militia before 1916 constitutes service in the "federally recognized National Guard" for the purpose of determining retired pay under Title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

### STATUTES AND REGULATIONS INVOLVED

The pertinent statutory provisions and regulations are set forth in the Appendix to the petition for a writ of certiorari in *United States* v. *Price*, No. 248, this Term.

### STATEMENT

Respondent's testator was a member of the Maine National Guard from April 26, 1901 until July 11, 1927. He applied for retirement benefits under Title III of P.L. 810, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act, Act of June 29, 1948, 62 Stat. 1081 (R. 11, 14, 19) which for computing the required twenty years of Federal service for retirement purposes authorized the inclusion of service in the federally-recognized National Guard prior to 1933. He did not have the requisite twenty years of Federal service unless his service as an officer in the Maine National

Guard prior to June 3, 1916, during which period he attended drills, target practices, and summer encampments, was includible. The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, rejected his claim on the ground that National Guard service prior to June 3, 1916, the date of enactment of the National Defense Act, 39 Stat. 166, could not be credited for retirement purposes, because it was not Federal service within the meaning of the 1948 Act (R. 12, 19, 20). Respondent's testator thereupon brought suit in the Court of Claims[1] which held on the stipulated facts, in an opinion rendered October 2, 1951, Judge Madden dissenting (R. 21) in the *William G. Price, Jr.* suit [which it was stipulated would govern the instant suit] that service after the passage of the Dick Act of 1903, 32 Stat. 775,[2] counted as federally recognized National Guard service for purposes of retirement under the 1948 Act (R. 14-21). After receipt of the report of the General Accounting Office showing the amount due on the basis of the court's opinion, judgment was entered in favor of respondent for $2474.97 on April 15, 1952 (R. 25). Respondent's motion to amend the judgment was denied on May 6, 1952 (R. 25-26).

---

[1] Respondent executrix was substituted as plaintiff on June 8, 1951 (R. 14).

[2] No claim was made for service in the National Guard prior to January 21, 1903, when the Dick Act was passed (R. 7, 14).

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

In this case, as in *United States* v. *Price*, No. 248, this Term, presenting the same question and now pending on petition for a writ of certiorari, we submit that the Court of Claims was in error in holding that the respondent was entitled to credit for service in the National Guard prior to June 3, 1916. The reasons for granting the writ in this case are identical with those set forth in the petition for certiorari in the *Price* case, to which the attention of the Court is respectfully invited.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in the *Price* case, it is respectfully submitted that this petition for a writ of certiorari should also be granted.

PHILIP B. PERLMAN
*Solicitor General*

AUGUST 1952.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1952—217905/P.O.173

FILE COPY

SEP 27 1952

No. 250

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1952

---

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Petitioner,*

v.

CORA PRESSON PARTRIDGE, Executrix of the Estate of George McL. Presson

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to The United States Court of Claims**

---

## BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

---

SAMUEL T. ANSELL,
712 Tower Building,
Washington 5, D. C.
*Counsel for Respondent*

*Of Counsel:*
ANSELL AND ANSELL

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1952

---

No. 250

---

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Petitioner,*

v.

CORA PRESSON PARTRIDGE, Executrix of the Estate of George McL. Presson

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to The United States Court of Claims**

---

## BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

---

### Opinion Below

The opinion of the Court of Claims (R. 14-21) is not reported.

### Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of this Court is as stated in the Petition (pp. 1-2).

## Question Presented and Statutes Involved

The question presented and the statutes involved here are as stated in respondent's brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari in *United States* v. *Price*, No. 248, this Term.

## Statement

The original plaintiff in this suit in the court below was George McL. Presson, a brigadier general of the Maine National Guard who died in his 86th year while this suit was pending. Upon the suggestion of his death and on motion therefor Cora Presson Partridge, the executrix, was substituted as plaintiff (R .14). It was stipulated in the Court of Claims that this case should be governed by the decision in the case of *William G. Price, Jr.*, and on April 15, 1952, judgment was entered in favor of respondent for $2,474.97 (R. 25). The facts and law upon which the judgment rests generally correspond to those in the *Price* case, now pending before this Court upon petition for writ of certiorari, No. 248, this Term.

## Reasons for Opposing the Granting of the Writ

The reasons for opposing the writ in the *Price* case are essentially those made by the respondent in this case. We respectfully ask that they be adopted in this case.

## Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted for the reasons set forth in opposition to the writ in the *Price* case, the petition for the writ of certiorari in this case should not be granted.

SAMUEL T. ANSELL,
712 Tower Building,
Washington 5, D. C.
*Counsel for Respondent*

*Of Counsel:*
ANSELL AND ANSELL

September 27, 1952.